COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 6025-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 1004

Subject: Liability; Civil and Criminal Procedure; Courts; Political Subdivisions; Tax and

Revenue-General

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: February 23, 2016

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies Supreme Court Rule 52.08 to prohibit a political

subdivision from joining certain class actions.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 6025-01 Bill No. SB 1004 Page 2 of 5 February 23, 2016

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

☐ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 6025-01 Bill No. SB 1004 Page 3 of 5 February 23, 2016

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Oversight was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on prior year information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation this year, HB 2242, officials at the **City of Kansas City** assumed this proposal extends current restrictions already imposed on cities to other political subdivisions. Therefore, no new costs or loss in revenue should be experienced from this proposal with respect to telecommunication companies.

Oversight assumes this proposal prohibits a political subdivision from participating in any action in Missouri State Court as a representative or member of a class to enforce or collect any tax. This proposal is referring to telecommunication companies and adding counties, cities, villages, towns and other political subdivision to amend Missouri Supreme Court Rule 52.08. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 direct fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials at the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the Department of Revenue and the Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the following counties: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Bollinger, Boone, Buchanan, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Christian, Clay, Cole, Cooper, DeKalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jackson, Jasper, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Maries, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Mississippi, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Phelps, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, Shelby, St. Charles, St. Louis, St. Francois, Taney, Warren, Wayne and Worth did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

L.R. No. 6025-01 Bill No. SB 1004 Page 4 of 5 February 23, 2016

<u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Officials at the following cities: Ashland, Belton, Bernie, Bonne Terre, Boonville, California, Cape Girardeau, Clayton, Columbia, Dardenne Prairie, Des Peres, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Gladstone, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark, Lee Summit, Liberty, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Pacific, Peculiar, Pineville, Popular Bluff, Raytown, Republic, Richmond, Rolla, Sedalia, Springfield, St. Charles, St. Joseph, St. Louis, St. Robert, Sugar Creek, Sullivan, Warrensburg, Warrenton, Webb City, Weldon Spring and West Plains did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2017 (10 Mo.)	FY 2018	FY 2019
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2017 (10 Mo.)	FY 2018	FY 2019
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

This could have a direct fiscal impact to small businesses as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 6025-01 Bill No. SB 1004 Page 5 of 5 February 23, 2016

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

City of Kansas City
Office of the Attorney General
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Department of Revenue
Office of Administration
Division of Budget and Planning

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

February 23, 2016

Ross Strope Assistant Director February 23, 2016